# PISTOL-PACKIN' PEURIFOY

According to an article on John Peurifoy by Flora Lewis in the N.Y. Times Magazine Section, July 18, 1954, US Ambassador Peurifoy was sent by Washington to Guatemala with instructions to "get rid of the Reds". "The strategy....was to be a squeeze. Gradual mounting pressure was to be applied. At each step, according to State Department theoreticians, one of two things would happen. Non-Communists in Guatemala would rise to wipe out the festering source of their troubles, or the Communists would be forced to clutch more desperately, more openly, for brute power. Every single battle the Communists might win would only recruit and strengthen the forces working for their defeat. On the tactical level, and as the ultimate reserve, rebel leader Carlos Castillo Armas secured the money to buy weapons and start building up an army over a year ago."

"Peurifoy had his time-table fairly well mapped out before he ever got to Guatemala." He tried to make the Guatemalan Government see that "whether it whipped or embraced the United Fruit Company, the United States care supremely about only one thing—ousting Communists from positions of control." "Two days after Arbenz resigned, Peurifoy said jokingly, 'People are complaining that I was forty-five minutes off schedule.'"

"Those were tense hectic days." Peurifoy was in the center of everything. "Decisions had to be made instantaneously, sometimes in a setting of well-oiled tommy guns. Peurifoy poked a pistol in a shoulder holster and lengthened his stride."

Thus this fact article on Peurifoy and the job he did in, or, should we say, on, Guatemala.

Apart from the single fact that the "Reds" weren't reds at all, but very mild New Dealers modelling their government on that of the late F.D. Roosevelt, the facts of a major crime committed by a great country on a very small country are fairly well admitted and described in this article.

In 1950 we condemned the invasion of China through Korea and Formosa by the US, using Rhee and Chiang as cats' paws. We now condemn this murder of a republic in the Western Hemisphere at our very door.

In the case of Guatemala the facts are so clear that even the moderate and cautious CCF party of Canada could not stomach it and in their national convention urged the Canadian government to call for a meeting of the UN Security Council to determine whether there had been a violation of the UN charter. They used strong words: "This convention strongly condemns the aggressive armed attack against the legitimate government of Guatemala by reactionary military elements, backed by the United Fruit Co., and the US State Department..."

Guatemala has the same percentage of Communists as the US has: one-thirtieth of one per cent. And the US rulers don't give a hoot how many Communists there are, either here or there. It is not Communists but New Dealers the US rulers hate. Don't you remember the hate-Roosevelt suburbanites and clubmen? Their bloodthirsty threats? Those very irresponsibles are now in power! Roosevelt was no Communist. But the men in the big chairs in the big windows with the big cigars who think the N.Y. Times is a radical paper pinned the label on Roosevelt and today they are in full cry to pin the label on the whole Roosevelt and Truman era, the twenty years of treason."

The gigantic fiction in Flora Lewis's article, which in Hitler's day we called the big lie, is in saying Peurifoy tried to make Guatemala see that the US didn't care how it treated the United Fruit Co., but "cared supremely about only one thing—ousting Communists from positions of control."

The exact opposite is the truth. It was the United Fruit Co. which the US cared supremely about, and the only crime which pistol-packin' Peurifoy was interested in was that Guatemala disputed the sovereignty of said company. Not until he got a government in office that understood his point of view and began jailing strikers wholesale, and disenfranchising the people in thorough-going fascist fashion, shooting strike

leaders, was he satisfied.

If the CIO and AFL leaders in the US, who know that these leaders were no more red than Reuther or Meany, make no more than formal protests and take this slaughter lying down they will be handing the rope to their own hangman.

For here in Guatemala, hiding behind the phony red-terror, the economic royalists of the US are striking a blow at the heart of American labor and laying the axe to the root of American democracy.

## RELIGIOUS ART

The World Council of Churches is sponsoring an exhibit of religious art in connection with its Second Assembly. Its catalogue has an introduction by Prof. Paul Tillich and Prof. Theodore M. Greene, which says that art is implicitly religious "if it expresses, in whatever fashion, the artist's sensitive and honest search for ultimate meaning in terms of his own contemporary culture. If religious be defined as man's ultimate concern for Ultimate Reality, all art which reflects, however partially and distortedly, this ultimate concern is at least implicitly religious, even if it makes no use whatever of a recognizable religious subject-matter or any traditional religious symbols.

"Authentic art is explicitly religious if it expresses the artist's sensitive and honest search for ultimate meaning and significance with th aid of a recognizable religious subject-matter or religious symbols....In the Christian tradition, all Biblical material and such symbols as the Cross are religious in this sense. The mere use of such material does not of course, guarantee either artistic integrity or significant religious expressiveness. Indeed, much so-called religious art today is totally lacking in both artistic and religious value, despite its use of traditional religious subject-matter and symbolism. It lacks artistic vitality and is therefore inexpressive; it is therefore necessarily devoid of significant religious content or meaning.

"The great religious art of the past is bound to be more intelligible and acceptable to us because we are familiar with it. Contemporary religious art which is dynamic and path-finding is difficult for us to comprehend because it speaks to us in an unfamiliar style, and it is deeply disturbing because it is so often anguished and violent. This is, however, inevitable because each age must develop its own style and idiom and because our times are times of violence and anguish, anxiety and despair.

"It is not strange that our most sensitive and creative artists should so poignantly express this cultural distress in such baffling ways; nor is it surprising that they should so seldom express a triumphant faith or the peace that passeth all understanding. In an age of spiritual turmoil and anxiety, when all spiritual affirmations are difficult and rare, they have at least had the courage and the artistic integrity not to retreat into an empty formalism, or a traditionalistic conventionalism, or a dishonest saccharine prettiness. This courage of theirs may well be prophetic of a new religiously oriented cultural vitality which, we can hope, is slowly and painfully coming into being in our day."

Within the limits of the field covered, these words are wise leading and in the right direction.

## PRIDE OR PROFIT

Have just read a book by Maurice Hindus, "Crisis in the Kremlin". It describes some of the difficulties encountered by the Bolsheviks in guiding the ship of the Soviet State through the political icebergs that threatened to sink it, over the treacherous shoals of internal subversion, and under the guns of an implacably hostile world. He tells of Stalin's errors in statecraft and of his harsh methods of correcting them. Yet he pays tribute to Stalin's great achievement in building up a strong Soviet power and people.

On laying down this book, one wondered about the title, and if perhaps he had got his Crisis in the wrong place. The chief fault is that Hindus presents the USSR in a vacuum or as if it had been the chief duty of this revolutionary state to act always in such a way as not to disturb the capitalist world, which is regarded apparently as the world, fixed forever and never to be changed.

Criticism is always valuable if it takes into account the whole world situation and follows the direction and development of fascism as carefully as those of communism. For just as communism moves from state to state and takes new forms and colors as it moves, so fascism moves too. The full force of the fascist challenge has moved to America. Whether or not it has achieved a position of absolute power here, it is certainly within reach of achieving it. Those forces of liberalism which could stop it appear to have withered from within, like an apple with a diseased core.

Liberalism has its pride too. There are times when it will sacrifice anything and any number of victims to save what it calls its "principles". Here we say that these "principles" may usually be translated into the comfortable material environment in which this "liberalism" usually exists? After all, a writer is a writer, not a cab-driver. And he must be published if his children are to eat. And publishers these days do not publish books about the Crisis in Washington.

Hindus is a Russian and speaks and reads the language. So he is familiar with whatever gaucheries may be culled from the pages of Pravda. But it would seem that he had not used his excellent knowledge of English to read US state papers. He has written an appendix to his book "proving" that the USSR started the Korean war. We wonder what he thought of his "proof" when the South Korean Ambassador Ben C. Limb openly admitted, indeed proudly proclaimed, that the said war was started by South Korea.

During the all-too-brief period of US-USSR friendship, when these two great powers needed each other desperately in the conflict with Germany, our editor found himself on the same platform with Maurice Hindus supporting this friendship. At that time Hindus beat his breast and repented his folly. Why? He had been in Russia just previous to the Hitler onslaught and had scolded the Russians for putting arms into the hands of children as well as for using other harsh methods in strengthening their borders. How foolish he had been, he cried! He would be slower next time to criticize.

## ZIONIST FRUSTRATION

The American Zionists are feeling the jaws of a trap they themselves set. In the June, 1954, Bulletin of the Council they lash out in frustrated anger at everything except the thing that causes their distress. That thing is or has been their uncritical acceptance of the premise of US policy since the death of Roosevelt. The premise they have swallowed, bait, hook, and sinker, is the fiction of Soviet aggression.

They say, for instance, "America, having reluctantly taken over the mantle of leadership in the Middle East from the faltering hands of the British, has now set about repeating all those mistakes which led to the collapse of the British position in that area in 1947." As a matter of fact the American Zionists are just as American as they are Zionist. They like America to be the big new leader of the world. Only they want America's bigness to be an umbrella under which Israel may flourish. And they forget that what is quantitatively big may be qualitatively small or even less than nothing.

They hurry on to say, "Since the US Government faces an aggressive Soviet Union, it assumes that any alliance it proclaims to be anti-Communist will somehow be viable, regardless of internal stresses and strains." Thus they do not criticize the US system of aggressive alliances on the periphery of the USSR. They simply criticize the particular countries included in the alliance. But these countries are large and powerful and on the borders of the USSR. In an alliance of this kind one cannot be choosy.

One must take what's at hand. Turkey has common frontiers with Bulgaria, Soviet Azerbaijan, Soviet Armenia and Georgia. Turkey is a must in an alliance of this kind. With Turkey go naturally other Moslem states, among them Iraq which is "in a de facto state of war with Israel."

The US is shipping arms to Iraq with which Iraq fights Israel. The US is trying to strengthen the weak points on the periphery of Russia. To do this the Bulletin says they are strengthening "just those elements of Arab society which are the weak points themselves."

Quite so. Now note how these Zionists flounder in their own net: "Thus, although it must be evident that the chief appeal of the Soviet Union throughout Asia is the general debility of social and economic relations, the State Department, evidently not even comprehending the origins of the weaknesses it is trying to eliminate, continues providing support, both moral and material, to the most stagnant strata of Arab society. The chief beneficiary of this policy is Soviet propaganda."

True. Too true. But why is Soviet propaganda thus served? It is because Soviet policy bases itself on the Arab peoples and not on "the cliques of irresponsible adventurers, rhetoricians and incompetents now at the helm of almost every Arab country."

And why does the US furnish arms to these cliques? The Zionists know the answer, or at least they more than hint at the answer: "What they actually need arms for most of all is to protect themselves against their own populations." Precisely. There was a very recent case of that. Not in the Middle East but right here on our own doorstep. Let the Zionists take note of it. The people of Guatemala had their own government, voted into power by themselves, democratically and constitutionally. The US thereupon sent arms and the man (Peurifoy) to re-instal and protect a company-bought clique "against their own population."

Have the American Zionists forgotten the basis of Judaism which is the foundation of civilization? They should be able to detect fascism, however clever its disguise, however padded its approach. They could recognize it in Hitler. But by the time Mindszenty came along they had put on State Department blinkers and couldn't see it. Now that the State Department is itself honey-combed with it they are totally blind.

They should re-examine their premise.

## EVANSTON—YES OR NO?

In June, 1954, at a church conference in Bratislava in Slovakia, Dr. Ladislas Pap, Dean of the Budapest Theological Seminary, had some things to say about the truly historic work of Bishop Albert Bereczky and other church leaders in connection with the World Council of Churches. It was these men who first recognized the danger of the World Council becoming the exponent of a certain block of political powers and proposed a biblical study of previous World Council Statements (at Toronto and Rolle) as well as a thorough-going biblical preparation for the Second Assembly at Evanston.

The result of this study, after stressing points of agreement, went on in a spirit of love to raise certain objections to the manner in which the World Council expressed the Main Theme and Subsidiary Topics for Evanston. Dr. Pap said that these objections were two-fold:

"First, we failed to recognise the integration and organic connection of the Subsidiary Topics with the Main Theme, an arrangement detrimental both to the Subsidiary Topics and the Main Theme itself. We believe that not only faith and hope, that is, promise and hope, but also faith and love belong inseparably together, love that issues in deeds. As there is no living faith without producing deeds, the Church cannot witness to her hope in Christ without witnessing to the consequences of the Christian Hope with regard to our earthly life and social relations. We maintain therefore that all the six Subsidiary Topics must branch forth, in an organic manner, from the Main Theme.

"Our second objection was that the Subsidiary Topics also lacked a

sufficient Biblical foundation. Some of them had no Biblical foundation at all (e.g., International Affairs). Yet no matter how serious our objections were to some of the preparatory statements on the Subsidiary Topics, we took the same course as adopted with regard to the Main Theme, that is, we tried to stress agreements, trying to find a common basis in order to make our critical statements while standing on that common ground."

Dr. Pap went on to say that the chief testimony of the sister churches, Lutheran and Evangelical, Czech, Slovakian, and Hungarian, would be to tell the world what Christ—the Hope of the World means "to us...in 1954, in a social order of people's democracy, devoted to the cause of building up socialism."

This is being written in the week preceding the Second Assembly. We have referred to the modern imperialists as the kind of men of whom Jesus spoke, who would not enter the Kingdom of Heaven themselves and who shut the door in the faces of others who would enter.

Through every panel of the ecumenical Assembly at Evanston will walk the fresh indignant ghost of a little nation murdered by order of the US Secretary of State, a man singled out and honored many times by the ecumenical churches.

That nation is Guatemala.

That man is John Foster Dulles.

Will the Assembly recognize this ghost?

Will the conscience of the Assembly take cognizance of its own moral predicament in having accepted this man as a Christian man and having listened to his voice with the deference due to a Christian leader?

Will the Assembly face the responsibility of its own moral prestige? Will it throw the weight of its moral influence <u>for</u> or <u>against</u> the people of Guatemala?

No abstract pronouncements, however strong, however lofty, will serve as a substitute for a simple sharp <u>yes</u> and <u>no</u> in this concrete instance of actual and present injustice. <u>Yes</u> to the victim! <u>No</u> to the aggressor!

\+ + + + + + + + + + +

## THE WESTERN CHURCHES AND THE COLD WAR

The second World War caused many leading Churchmen to question the moral standards of the West, and to face frankly the challenge of Communism. For instance, the Bishop of Bradford in 1942 wrote a Foreword to the first pamphlet issued by the newly-formed "Council of Ministers and Clergy for Common Ownership", of which he was Chairman. In this Foreword he summed up not only his own attitude then, but the attitude of many other Church leaders, as follows:

(1) "Our present economic system is immoral and un-Christian. It promotes mass selfishness, class division and international war. It is a worship of Mammon, and as such is a moral outrage.

(2) "This being so, it is part of the Church's duty to God to say so. When something is so plainly the work of the devil, both in its principle and in its effects, nothing can excuse a minister of Christ from working for its destruction.

(3) "The private ownership of the means of production is the nerve-centre of the system. To attack it is to attack the particular point at which the immorality of the system is most manifest and most corrosive."

That was twelve years ago. The Captialist system has not changed. But all countries which have overthrown it, and adopted a socialist economic system, are now themselves condemned as the "Communist enemy." The war-talk of Western politicians and soldiers has been brutally frank. ("The Korean war is a useful dress-rehearsal for the Third World War" (Field Marshal Alexander, 20/6/52). "We are interested in killing as many Chinese and North Koreans as possible....Give up the idea that war

(Continued on page 9)

# US WANTS CHINA

By Louise Harding

Those "Defense" Pacts:

By radio (July 1) we heard that Chiang had set up a defense council t manage any attack on the mainland. July 25, AP reported from Taipeh that the official newspaper, China Daily News, today urged early conclusion of a mutual defense pact between the United States and Nationalist China. Informal talks already have taken place in both Washington and Taipeh..... the pact to include the island strongpoints the Nationalists hold off the Red China coast, such as Quemoy, Matsu and the Tachens. The pact, it added, must in no way hinder the Nationalists in their "ultimate objective, a counterattack against the mainland."

Recently, when a Chiang gunboat fired upon, and seized, a Chinese tanker, China demanded that US take responsibility for the action of its satellite. US refused. Blockading is an act of war.

July 7, San Mateo Times carried a Drew Pearson item which said:

"The Russians are furious because Chinese Nationalist warships intercepted and seized one of their best tankers, and they probably will retaliate by daring the Nationlists to take on the Russian destroyers which will accompany them from now on.

"The Russians know that the US had a naval seaplane circling over the Russian tanker most of the time before it was seized. The plane was in direct contact with the Chinese Nationalists and tipped them off where to pick up the tanker. However, the United States did not have one of its own warships involved."

July 25, Great Britain filed a protest against an attack by two Chinese fighter planes on a British airliner off the China coast. US promptly ordered two carriers into the area. By the 26th, it was reported from London that Britain considered the incident closed, China having apologized and offered to pay indemnity for loss of ship and lives; she explained that the airliner had been mistaken for one of Chiang's. The Chinese Vice Foreign Minister stated:

"Aircraft of the remnant Chiang Kai-shek gang in Taiwan have enlarged further their sphere of harassment covering the coastal areas and islands of China and practiced piratical interception and robbery of merchant vessels of various nations sailing to China for trade, in a desperate attempt to create tension in Asia."

However, on the 25th, a statement by Dulles was broadcast claiming the airliner was deliberately shot down. At that time, he could not have possibly have known whether this was or was not the case.

July 26, US Navy planes were reported (UP) to have shot down two attacking Chinese fighters on the preceding night, in an air battle over the China sea.

UP report says "the Navy pilots...sent the two Red planes spinning into the ocean about 12 miles off the coast of Red-held Hainan island.

Since the British airship sank 30 miles from Hainan, where was the necessity for the US planes to run so close to shore, on their alleged "humanitarian rescue" operation? Moreover, on the evening of the 26th, your reporter heard an ultra-reactionary radio talker named Norman Beatty say that the encounter between the Chinese and US planes took place less than three miles from Hainan. "Freedom of the seas" was involved, shouted Beatty; and he asserted that US intends to go ahead alone, if necessary, in fighting Communism: that if the allies will not follow, they will "have to take the consequences" - although, said he, this will also be disastrous for the United States.

In view of the distances cited above, it is the opinion of this reporter that the US carrier planes, under the command of the belligerent Admiral R.B. Carney, might have been deliberately desirous of stirring up trouble, being disgruntled by the recent diplomatic defeat in Indo-China.

The use of the napalm bomb, upon even children and women; and the

dreadful crime of hurling the atom bombs upon the Japanese people without the slightest military necessity, hardly point out the clique ruling USA as distinguished humanitarians.

YO BANFA

A New Zealander named Rewi Alley, from a family of educationalists, went to China and became interested in co-operative work while Chiang was in power. He is still engaged in that task, and wrote a powerful and useful book called "Yo Banfa" (We Have a Way). It is not much known in this "land of the free", since it is officially verboten. So, let us read a little from "Yo Banfa" and see how life went in China under America's protege, Chiang:

"The silk filatures of Shanghai had been amongst the more nightmarish of the places I had been inspecting, with their long lines of children, many not more than eight or nine years old, standing for 12 hours over boiling vats of cocoons, with swollen red fingers, eyes inflamed, eye muscles sagging, many crying from the beating of the foreman, who would walk up and down behind them with a piece of No. 8 gauge wire as a whip; with tiny arms often scalded in punishment if they passed a thread incorrectly; in rooms so full of steam that in the Shanghai heat just standing in them for a few minutes was unbearable for me."

Rewi Alley told Agnes Smedley "how for me the final disillusionment about any possibility of reform under the old system had come when I saw a group of lads who had been organising silk workers crudely 'executed' at Wusih as 'communists.'....It suddenly became very clear to me that the only way was basic change."

On Conscripts:

"Out of one army of conscripts for Sinkiang, 10,000 left Szechuan, 700 got to Lanchow, and the handful who reached Sinkiang died there, for they arrived in the depth of the winter and had no warm clothing. The ones who would die most easily were the kids of 16 or so, who could not fight so well for their food, always a racket in the hands of the old soldiers in charge of the convoy. They would get thin and weak and then dysentery would clean them up. The brutes who had undertaken to deliver them would walk behind them and beat them with sticks, urging them forward. Sometimes the suffering lad would lie down in the dust and die, with the driver senselessly beating, beating, and still beating. Not once or twice, but every time one took the road to Paochi, or south to Hanchung, one saw these scenes. The human waste was incalculable, the degradation complete.

As one looks at the soldier of today one feels that the scenes which were a daily occurrence on the Tsingling Shan roads around Shwangshihpu must have happened in the realm of nightmare. ....There was a never-ending procession of Szechuan farmer boys being dragged to the Northwest, and leaving their bones along the way. What conceivable purpose the whole operation was intended to serve, God alone knew."

KARANJIA'S "CHINA STANDS UP":

Published in 1952, this is an extremely important work. The jacket says: "Probably the most controversial and widely read journalist of India, R.K. Karanjia is Editor-in-Chief of the well-known Blitz publications, of which the parent Blitz has the largest sales of any English weekly news-magazine in Asia. In Sept.-Oct., 1951, he was invited to New China as a Deputy Leader of the First Indian Goodwill Mission to go there."

Contradicting the propaganda in the US press, Karanjia, on the ground, discovered that the Chinese people are not made to starve in order to spare rice for India.

"Let me tell them (the Washingtonians) we have seen the Chinese people eating. We have gone out of our way to take meals with farmers in their cottages, factory workers in their canteens, even 'coolies' in their humble huts; and we can assure them that the Chinese people today eat more food of greater variety and better vitamin value than not only their prototypes in India, but in Western Europe and Britain as well."

In the villages to which land reform had come only after liberation,

the farmers were found "eating, drinking, dressing and living better than their class anywhere else in Asia, including India. Landlords did not exist any more."

In the north, villages which had early benefited from land reform under the old Soviets organised by the Communists,

"Villagers lived in beautiful brick-and-stone cottages, used electricity, drove rubber-tyred waggons, tractors and all types of modern agricultural machinery, owned radio-sets and had up-to-date postal and telegraph facilities, their post offices acting as banks and libraries..... The peasants enjoyed, in brief, amenities unknown to and probably unheard of by any other Asian farmers. More than such material advantages, they were socially and politically more advanced than many of our townsfolk. They had complete and effective village democracy, with all its essentials of elections, people's self-government, people's courts and banks, mass organisations of people's power, their own village militia and a good start made in collective and mechanised farming through mutual-aid teams and village cooperatives.

"Given land, liberty, and a genuine people's democracy we saw Chinese farmers working like men possessed....producing bumper crops of grain and cotton, reviving old cottage industries that were the pride of China before foreign machine-made goods threw them out of the market, laying railway lines and telegraph wires, building dams and dykes, harnessing the 'rivers of sorrow'....."

White Light on US Imperialism:

Recently, the "senator from Formosa" tried to push a measure through Congress that would provide for the withdrawal of US from "United" Nations if China is admitted in place of the puppet of US now on Formosa. He claims to have considerable senatorial support for such a policy. Karanjia's book throws the brightest of white lights on the motives of such individuals:

"Having aided the reactionary Kuomintang regime, America systematically started to gain control of the economy of the country behind the 'legal' Chinese government, the blanket Friendship, Commerce and Navigation Treaty concluded between the US and the Nationalist Government of China, on Nov. 4, 1946, threw open the doors of China to American business. American monopolies received the right to establish any and every sort of enterprise in China with complete freedom of action.

"Following the Treaty, many definite agreements were signed, legalising the domination of American imperialism. .....With all these agreements went the right to direct interference in the administration of China. Kuomintang China became for all practical purposes a colony of the United States.....American finance-capital and monopolies pushed Britain out from China. The National City Bank of New York and the Chase National Bank took over the money and credit markets. Chinese capital, mainly concentrated in the hands of the 'Four Families' and totalling over two billion dollars, was put into American banks, which enabled the latter to dictate the rate of exchange of the Chinese dollar.

"American interests took over the most of the going industrial concerns and established control over the minefields, oilfields, transport system and power plants. Besides taking over existing industries, American finance capital bought up entire provinces and territories with all their assets for a song. For example, the American Pirnie,.Lee & Co. concluded an 'agreement' with the provincial government of Kwangtung and Kwangsi for the exploitation of natural resources; the South China Development Corporation, a syndicate of a number of American monopolies, signed an 'agreement' with the Governor of Kwangtung, Sun Tse-wen, and gave him a seat on the directorate of the syndicate.

"But while plans were drawn up for the development of the natural resources, no material advances were made in this direction. American 'investments' largely took the form of government deliveries to the Kuomintang and the financing of business operations of trade, transport and credit. This gave them the power to dump goods on the Chinese markets,

ruining in the process Chinese trade and national industries and causing dislocation of the entire Chinese economy. The high-powered American competition completely ruined the middle and the small capitalists, throwing thousands of workers out of jobs. The simultaneous speculations of the 'Four Families' degraded agriculture, caused sky-rocketing inflation and let loose Bedlam in the country.

"The stakes were very big - very big indeed. America wanted the war booty of the whole of China, lock, stock and barrel and, by 1947, secret plans had been prepared between Chiang Kai-shek, his Madame, Dr. Sun Fo, the leader of the High Command of the Kuomintang, trusted equally by Chinese and American reaction, the US Military Advisory Group at Nanking and General Douglas MacArthur, who had already conceived his mission as that of the Napoleon of the Pacific, to hand over China to the United States.

"This plan is said to have had the blessing and consent of the American Republican Party and also some influential Democrats. It invited the United States to establish military and naval bases in China, to take over her railways and river-ways, to control her economy and supervise her finances, and appoint General MacArthur as some sort of Governor-General of China. 'Chiang,' according to Jack Belden, 'was to be offered equal partnership with Hirohito as a kind of sun-emperor under MacArthur. The idea was to extend American sovereignty westwards in the form of some sort of a United States of the Pacific, with China, Japan, Korea, Philippines, Formosa, et cetera, as the confederated states. Madame Chiang herself took the proposal to the States."

So many fine plans gone a-glimmering! No wonder Eisenhower - indebted to the Rockefeller group for his nomination, declared, the other day, that "he is completely and unalterably opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations under present circumstances."

\+ + + + + + + + + + + +

The Western Churches and the Cold War - (Continued from page 5)

against Communism will ever end" (Lt. Gen. Ridgway, Feb. 1952). "The United States must take the offensive against Russia. It would win for us a popular title: we would become the first 'aggressors for peace'" (Francis Matthews, US Navy Secretary, Aug. 1950). Even the gangster Chiang Kai-shek is praised (Roman Catholic Tablet) and "the Chinese Nationalists, in continuing and intensifying their raids on Communist China, will perform a useful function" (Tablet 7/2/53).

'The Western Churches, with few exceptions, have....given moral support to the "cold war" against Communism. There is abundant material available on...the development of Christian experience and work in Russia and Central Europe. But apart from stories from political refugees this kind of news has been suppressed.

The evidence of Orthodox and Protestant Church leaders such as Patriarch Alexius of Moscow, Archbishop Luke of Simferopol, Patriarch Justinian of Rumania, Bishop Bereczky of Hungary, Prof. Hromadka of Czechoslovakia, does not help the "cold war" against Communism. On the contrary. Their evidence is that their Christian work is not hindered but considerably helped by many factors in a Communist society. In some cases they have stated categorically that their experiences in capitalist and socialist society have convinced them that the basis of Christian society must be socialist. Here is Prof. Hromadka's clear statement:

"We have to understand that the basis of the new social structure has been amazingly broadened, and that millions of working people have come to a new sense of human dignity. Our problem is whether we have the real faith to re-interpret the Gospel within the framework of the new Socialist order....The Protestant Churches in Hungary, which before the war were in mortal danger, are at present more vital and hopeful than any Churches I have seen in the West....A pagan society, with a Christian veneer, is much more dangerous to real freedom of faith than a society disclaiming any Christian influence. The real Church becomes buried under accretions and forms which have nothing to do with the Gospel."

—From Bulletin No. 6 by E.V. Tempest, 60 Lister Lane, Bradford, Yorks.

# ONE

AUGUST 1954



EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Rev. D. McKeen Reid
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson



**ONE** is published monthly by New Christian Books, 95 Argyle Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks


# ONE

The discovery of super-power, with its promise of plenty and its threat of annihilation, forces mankind to choose now between becoming nothing or becoming **one.**


August, 1954 Edited by Kenneth Leslie



## PISTOL-PACKIN' PEURIFOY

## ZIONIST FRUSTRATION

## EVANSTON--YES or NO?

By the Editor

## U.S. WANTS CHINA

By Louise Harding

## THE WESTERN CHURCHES AND THE COLD WAR

By E. V. Tempest